

University of Mississippi

**eGrove**

---

Meeting Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

2-1-1998

**February 1998**

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen\\_minutes](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Mississippi. Faculty Senate, "February 1998" (1998). *Meeting Minutes*. 2.  
[https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen\\_minutes/2](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/facsen_minutes/2)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

SENATE OF THE FACULTY, February 13, 1998

The Senate of the Faculty met in Room 106 of the Law School.

Present: D. Adler (2), N. Bercaw (3), L. Blenman (PPP), A. Bomba, G. Buskes, C. Cunningham, C. Dale (1, PP), A. Elsherbeni, W. Gardner (1), F. Gilbert(1), D. Graves, K. Green, F. Gu (1), L. Harper, R. Haws (P), F. Laurenzo, T. Marshall (P), J. Mizenko (P), C. Mullen, H. Owens\* (P), T. Ownby (2), J. S. Payne (1, PP), L. Pittman, S. Prasad\* (1, P), R. Pulliam (P), T. J. Ray, S. Rodgers (2,P), D. Schlenk (1), S. Schreiber, S. Skemp\* (1, P), M. Slattery (P), L. Smith (P), K. Sufka (P), P. Temple (1), M. Tew, M. Van Boening, Jay Watson (1), M. Wilder (2), J. Winkle (1),

Absent: K. Beason\* (PP), Coles\* (PP), R. Dorsey (2), A. Fisher-Wirth\* (1, P), R. Gordon (2), L. Hanshaw\* (P), F. Love\* (2,P), D. Nichols (5), J. F. Payne (3), W. Rayburn (4), J. Reidy (3,P), N. Schroeder (5), W. Scott\*(4,P), E. Sisson (4), M. Vinson (1, P), K. Wakefield (2,P), John Watson (3,P), R. Westmoreland (1, P), J. Williamson (1, PP), C. Wyandt\* (P), E. Young-Minor\* (4,P)

\* = Prior Notification of Absence Given, (x) = number of absences this session

Chair Karen Green called the meeting to order at 2:09.

Chair Green introduced Herb Deweese, Don Fruge, Gloria Kellum, and Brian Reithel, who informed the Senate about fundraising activities associated with the Sesquicentennial over the past year and plans for 1998. Information about fundraising through the foundation can be found at the [University of Mississippi Foundation home page](#). Faculty can assist the "Commitment to Excellence Campaign" by identifying needs and developing proposals, by identifying potential donors, by participating in and initiating alumni activities, and by cultivating potential donors.

The minutes of the January meeting were accepted (Moved, Cunningham; seconded, Watson).

Chair Green has met with Chancellor Khayat and reported that faculty would prefer the original proposal: that the Faculty Center be located in the University House next to the library. Chancellor Khayat agreed to this, and said that we would soon receive a letter to this effect. Officers of the Croft Institute will occupy some second floor offices until renovation of the "Y" building is complete. During this time, faculty will have use of the lower floor. Discussion continues about use of the second floor space after the Croft Institute leaves.

Chair Green reported the status of the "Extraordinary Teaching Policy". The Academic Council has accepted the most recent proposal and rejected the initial proposal generated by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate and Graduate Council have rejected the most recent proposal. There seems to be no middle ground. The Chancellor is seeking resources from the IHL to support teaching personnel at the "centers".

Reports from search committees.

Director of the Croft Institute: Two finalists will visit campus soon.

Dean of the College of Liberal Arts: Applications are being received

Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs: An ad has been placed.

Director of the EEO Office: Three finalists have been interviewed.

Conrad Cunningham, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee led the discussion about the [proposed copyright policy](#). A [discussion draft](#) of the policy prepared by Senator Cunningham is available for review. The University Research Board (URB) has been active in recent years in formulating and updating university policies, such as the patent policy and the research misconduct policy. Senators agreed on the need for such a policy. Primary concerns centered on the definition of "substantial use of university resources", and "partial intent to have commercial value". It seems that the proposed policy treats computer software differently than more traditional media. Policies from other universities clearly exclude work unless it is created with the "sole intended purpose" of having commercial value, and senators expressed the desire that UM's final policy clearly exclude some classes of intellectual

property. A peer review committee to arbitrate disagreements over copyright was supported by several senators. Some senators felt that even when there was substantial use of university resources reimbursement to the university was fairer than university ownership of a percentage of royalties.

T. J. Ray, Chair of the Faculty Governance Committee led the discussion about the proposed Honor Code and presented the committee's report.

1. The judgment of work in academic courses is and should remain a faculty prerogative, though there is no objection to the current Academic Discipline Committee having student and staff members. Faculty and students are more likely to accept judgments from such a group as now exists.
2. The proposed honor code is not an honor code because it lacks the essential ingredient that puts responsibility (and liability?) for reporting dishonesty on the shoulders of those who witness it. Few students and not many faculty members are interested in punishing students who have knowledge of cheating but who do not report it.
3. Implementation of any new code over such a long period of time will likely work against its effectiveness. Until all students were to fall under the code, there would exist a double standard.
4. The proposal offers a committee in which there will be no "institutional" memory, the result likely being that uneven application of punishment will occur over time.
5. The proposal offers no reason why the current procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty should not continue.

Senator Gilbert said that faculty and students should work together to develop an Honor Code if there is strong student support. Senator Mullen reported that at universities with Honor Codes, faculty are not allowed in the classroom during exams. Senator Ownby pointed out that many instances of academic dishonesty can only be enforced by students (such as purchasing term papers). As the Faculty Senate we should applaud the student efforts to establish an Honor Code, but state that we do not believe that the present proposal will accomplish the desired goals.

Senator Harper commented on the proposed ADA policy and requested that comments be forwarded to her.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00. Because the next regular meeting date falls during spring break, the next meeting of the Senate is Friday, March 20, at 2 PM.